

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the final office action mailed March 16, 2007. In the final office action the Examiner rejected claims 1-15, 42-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bates *et al.* (US 6,404,446) in view of Dolan *et al.* (US 5,801,702).

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are claims 1-15 and 42-53. Independent claims 1 and 42 have been amended. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs 0071-0075. Dependent claims 3, 5, 43, 44, and 47 have been amended to properly refer back to the amended independent claims. New claims 48-53 have been added. Support for these claims may be found, for example, in paragraphs 0081. No new matter has been added.

Interview Summary

The undersigned participated in a telephonic interview with Examiner Bashore and Eliza Stefaniw (Reg. No. 52,254) regarding this application on April 11, 2007. Claim limitations and possible amendments were discussed, although no agreement was reached.

The Claims

Before addressing the specific claim limitations, Applicant reiterates that the present invention provides a method for processing information in web-crawled documents and associating the text (called annotations in the claims) found in or near anchor tags (also variously called links, hyperlinks, or outbound links) with the documents pointed to by the anchor tags. The claimed method can be used to organize and (in claims 42-47) index **information about a document that resides in other documents** in a collection of linked documents so as to produce an index that can return a list of the most relevant documents in response to a user query. The “anchor map” in the pending claims is essentially the inverse of the “link log.”

The Examiner is respectfully reminded that **all words in a claim must be considered** and interpreted in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one skilled in the art. *See, e.g.*, MPEP §2111 and §2143.03. It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action addresses only certain portions of the claims, but fails to take into account the entire language of the claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to give due weight to the portions of the pending claims that characterize or identify relationships among the link log, link records,

sorted anchor map, and anchor records. Some of these additional portions of the claims are shown in bold text in the following remarks.

Bates does not disclose any of the limitations of the independent claims.

The user interface of Bates generates a map display while navigating hypertext documents to display the links between sites previously visited by the user. *See*, col. 7, lines 3-9. Bates provides no teachings regarding inbound links or crawled documents. Bates also does not provide any teachings regarding the relationship between an “anchor map” and a “link log.”

Thus, Bates does not disclose

“outputting a sorted anchor map that corresponds to the link log and that comprises a plurality of anchor records, each anchor record identifying a respective target document and **a list of inbound links, the list of inbound links identifying source documents that contain links to the respective target document**”

as recited in independent claim 1. Bates also does not disclose that the link records in the link log are based on “information extracted from crawled documents in the collection of linked documents.” Similarly, Bates does not disclose

“generating an anchor map that corresponds to the link log and that comprises a plurality of anchor records, each anchor record identifying a respective target document, **a list of inbound links, the list of inbound links identifying source documents that contain links to the respective target document**”

or

“**crawling** at least a subset of the documents in the collection of linked documents, and **extracting from the crawled documents information concerning outbound links** between documents in the collection of linked documents [and] **generating, based on the extracted information, a link log**”

as recited in independent claim 42.

Dolan also does not disclose inbound links to source documents

Like Bates, and unlike the current application, Dolan is directed to a graphical user interface for categorizing and displaying a navigation structure based on documents retrieved by the user from the network. *See*, e.g. column 8, lines 32-35 (teaching that Dolan’s system begins with no information about the documents in the document collection and is initiated

by the user entering a URL/URN.) In addition to the missing teachings in Dolan discussed in the last Amendment, no teaching regarding inbound links or crawled documents is found in Dolan. Dolan does not provide any teachings regarding the relationship between an “anchor map” and a “link log.”

Thus, like Bates, Dolan does not disclose

“outputting a sorted anchor map that corresponds to the link log and that comprises a plurality of anchor records, each anchor record identifying a respective target document and **a list of inbound links, the list of inbound links identifying source documents that contain links to the respective target document**”

as recited in independent claim 1. Dolan also does not disclose that the link records in the link log are based on “information extracted from crawled documents in the collection of linked documents.” Similarly, Dolan does not disclose

“generating an anchor map that corresponds to the link log and that comprises a plurality of anchor records, each anchor record identifying a respective target document, **a list of inbound links, the list of inbound links identifying source documents that contain links to the respective target document**”

or

“**crawling** at least a subset of the documents in the collection of linked documents, and **extracting from the crawled documents information concerning outbound links** between documents in the collection of linked documents [and] **generating, based on the extracted information, a link log**”

as recited in independent claim 42.

For at least these reasons, the pending claims are allowable over Bates, either alone, or in combination with Dolan.

All previous arguments and remarks are incorporated herein. In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-4000, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 16, 2007

/ Gary S. Williams / 31,066
Gary S. Williams (Reg. No.)
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
2 Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700
Palo Alto, CA 94306
(650) 843-4000